

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/614,599	614,599 07/07/2003		David P. Andrew	09800080-0104	7759
23552	7590	05/04/2006		EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC				DEBERRY, REGINA M	
P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903		55402-0903		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1647	
				DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
065 4-6 0	10/614,599	ANDREW ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Regina M. DeBerry	1647						
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Fe	hruany 2006							
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
4a) Of the above daim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· <u> </u>								
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachment(s)								
I) Dotice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)								
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)						
	o) [Other:							



DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-4, 29, 32, drawn to an isolated polypeptide, pharmaceutical composition comprising polypeptide and kit, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- II. Claims 5-14, drawn to the isolated nucleic acid, vector, host cell, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- III. Claims 15-17, drawn to the antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.
- IV. Claims 18 and 37, drawn to a method of determining presence of a polypeptide in a sample, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- V. Claims 19 and 38, drawn to a method for determining amount of nucleic acid in sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- VI. Claims 20-22, drawn to a method for screening for modulators, classified in class 435, subclass 7.8.
- VII. Claims 23, 24 and 39 drawn to a method of administering a polypeptide to a subject, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
- VIII. Claims 25, 26, 30, 33, drawn to a method of administering nucleic acid to a subject, pharmaceutical composition comprising nucleic acid and kit, classified in class 514, subclass 44.

IX. Claims 27, 28, 31, 34, 40 and 41, drawn to a method of administering an antibody to a subject, pharmaceutical composition comprising antibody and kit, classified in class 424, subclass 130.1.

X. Claims 35 and 36, drawn to method of using a transgenic animal, classified in class 800, subclass 3.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I/VI, VII, X; II/V, VIII and III/IV, IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product of Group I can be used in processes to make antibodies. The product of Group II can be used in processes to make recombinant proteins and the product of Group III can be used in processes of immunochromatography.

Inventions IV-IX are unrelated methods. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). The instant specification does not disclose that these methods would be used together. Each invention performs its function using structurally and functionally divergent material and/or has a different mode of operation. In addition, the distinct steps, methodology and materials require separate and distinct searches. For instance,

Art Unit: 1647 "

a search for a method of administering nucleic acid to a subject would not necessarily overlap with a search for a method to screen for cell modulators. In addition, some of the inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Therefore, a search and examination of all methods in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the searches for the methods are not co-extensive, the classification is different, and/or the subject matter is divergent.

Inventions I-III are unrelated products. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). Groups I-III have completely different structures, being made up of completely different building blocks. These very diverse structures result in completely different modes of operation and modes of function and effects. The polypeptide of Group I may be used in far-western assays or to make antibodies, while the nucleic acid of Group II and the antibodies of Group III cannot. The nucleic acid of Group II can be used in hybridization assays or to express polypeptides, a function that none of the products of Groups I and III share. Similarly, the antibody of Group III can be used to isolate/detect the polypeptide of Group I, which the polypeptide itself cannot do or the nucleic acid of Group II. In addition, the inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications.

Inventions I/V, VIII, IX and II/IV, VI, VII, IX and III/V-VIII, X are unrelated. The products are not used or otherwise involved in the processes.

The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejections are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search required for each group is not required for the other groups because each group requires a different non-patent literature search due to each group comprising different products and/or method steps and/or is recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/614,599

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Regina M. DeBerry whose telephone number is (571)

272-0882. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m.-6:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Brenda G. Brumback can be reached on (571) 272-0961. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMD 4/28/06

MARIANNE P. ALLEN
PRIMARY EYAMINER

Merianne P. aller

Page 8

11/647